

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-10, 12, 13 and 15-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 15-24 have been previously withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2 16021. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on JP 2 16021 and submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites:

An optical ferrule comprising a ferrule body; wherein a concave portion in which a gate for resin molding is disposed is formed in said ferrule body, and a depth of said concave portion is deeper than a height of a flash which is formed in said concave portion as a result of said resin molding.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the elements recited in independent claim 1. More specifically, Applicants submit JP 2 16021 does not teach, suggest or disclose at least "a flash which is formed in said concave portion" or that "a depth of said concave portion is deeper than a height of a flash which is formed in said concave portion as a result of said resin molding." As illustrated in FIG. 2 of JP 2 16021, there is a groove 12 for preventing a ferrule 1 from rotating, and the groove 12 is formed on a flange portion 11. Further, as illustrated in FIG. 6 in JP 2 16021, the gate 54 is not disposed in the groove 12 formed

on the flange portion 11. There is no gate in the groove 12, therefore, there is no flash formed in the groove 12. As such, JP 2 16021 does not disclose either "a flash which is formed in said concave portion," or "a depth of said concave portion is deeper than a height of a flash which is formed in said concave portion as a result of said resin molding." If the gate 54 were disposed in groove 12 so that it would be possible for flash to form, groove 12 would lose its concavity because as such, the depth of the concave portion would become filled. Therefore, Applicants submit that at least the flash and concave portion as recited in claim 1 are not anticipated by JP 2 16021.

Similarly, Applicants submit that that cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the elements claimed in independent claim 12. Independent claim 12 recites *inter alia*:

An optical ferrule comprising a ferrule body, wherein a concave portion is formed for confirming confirmation factors such as a material of said ferrule body or sorts of optical fiber held in said ferrule body; and said concave portion is formed in a flange portion of said ferrule body, and a gate for resin molding is disposed in said concave portion.

As discussed above, Applicants submit that the cited reference does not disclose that "a gate for resin molding is disposed in said concave portion." As noted above, if the gate 54 was disposed in groove 12, groove 12 would be filled and lose its concavity. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 12 is not anticipated by the cited references.

In addition, claims 2-3 and 13 each depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 or claim 12. They are therefore also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as presented with respect to claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being obvious over JP 2 16021. Applicants respectfully submit that this cited reference fails to teach, disclose or suggest each of the limitations of the pending claims. Claims 4-10 each depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, Applicants submit that JP 2 16021 fails to teach, disclose or suggest each of the limitations discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these grounds of rejection. Since Applicants' current remarks overcome the pending rejections, Applicants reserve the right to provide additional bases for overcoming the Examiner's rejections based on the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentably distinct from the cited references. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 2-10 and 13, which directly or indirectly depend on independent claims 1 and 12 respectively, are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejection.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Response to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 14998-255. Although no petition for time is believed to be necessary, in event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 14998-255.

Respectfully Submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

Date: June 28, 2006

BY: 

Richard Martinelli
Registration No. 52,003

Address:
Chadbourne & Parke, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile